DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 137 442 UD 016 798

AUTHOR Herr, Audrey
TITLE Summer Program For Special Schools for Socially Maladjusted Children.
INSTITUTION New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
PUB DATE 15 Aug 75
NOTE 29p.; New York City Board of Education Function No. 09-61603

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Emotionally Disturbed Children; Exceptional Children; Problem Children; *Reading Improvement; Reading Tests; Remedial Instruction; *Remedial Reading; *Socially Maladjusted
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; New York; New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This report is an evaluation of a New York City School District educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. The program was designed to serve 1,640 children attending special day schools, psychiatric hospitals, and day and residential treatment centers for the socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed in kindergarten through twelfth grade. The purpose of the program was to improve achievement in reading and to provide meaningful socialization activities for these children during the summer months. The major objective of the program was to help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading. The CROFT (Reading) criterion referenced tests were used as assessment measures. The program was staffed by 178 teachers and 46 paraprofessionals under the supervision of 21 teachers-in-charge. Two assistant coordinators and a project coordinator supervised the entire program. The participants were selected from twelve special day schools for socially maladjusted or emotionally disturbed children, nine psychiatric hospitals, 16 day and/or residential treatment centers for emotionally handicapped children, and 30 day and/or residential treatment centers for addicted children. These 67 sites, located in all of the five boroughs of New York City and four sites in upstate New York, were clustered into 21 school organizations for the purpose of supervision of the instructional program. An analysis of the data indicated that 70 percent of the participants mastered at least one instructional objective and that they did benefit substantially from the program. (Author/ES)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED137442

EVALUATION REPORT

Function No. 09-61603
School District 75

SUMMER PROGRAM FOR SPECIAL SCHOOLS FOR SOCIALLY MALADJUSTED CHILDREN

EVALUATION PERIOD

July 7, 1975 to August 15, 1975

Prepared by

AUDREY HERR

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD016798

An evaluation of a New York City School District educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89 10) performed for the Board of Education of the City of New York for Summer 1975.

Dr. Anthony J. Polemeni, Director

BOARD OF EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL EVALUATION
110 LIVINGSTON STREET, BROOKLYN, N. Y. 11201

PROGRAM ABSTRACT

The program provided reading instruction to 1484 Title I eligible pupils for 3-1/2 hours each day for 28 days, with some variations. Small group and individualized instruction was provided by 178 teachers assisted by 46 paraprofessionals, under the supervision of 21 teachers-in-charge. Two assistant coordinators and the project coordinator supervised the entire program. All pupils were given entry and mastery tests with standardized criterion-referenced tests from the CROFT reading system. A trip program provided recreational opportunities and socializing experiences.

The major evaluation objective of this program was achieved in that 70 percent of the participants mastered at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master. The data further indicated that pupils did benefit substantially and that the criterion-referenced test approach to the teaching of reading was an effective instructional procedure as evidenced by the post-instruction mastery of 20 instructional objectives by 35 to 100 percent of the students attempting them.

Program implementation was as proposed with the exception of having 90 percent (1484) of the anticipated 1640 participants. The pupils expressed and observed attitudes and behaviors further attested to the effectiveness of the program. In consideration of the factors mentioned it is recommended that this program be recycled.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	THE PROGRAM	1
	Description of the Program	1
	Implementation of the Program	3
II.	EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES	8
	Evaluation Objectives	8
	Observation of the Program	9
III.	FINDINGS	11
IV.	SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS	23

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Distribution of Pupils Tested on Each Instructional Objective, Their Mastery or Non-Mastery on Initial and Final Tests, in Numbers and Percentages	12
2.	Distribution of Pupil Non-Mastery on Pretest and No Posttest Follow-Up	14
3.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery of Instructional Objectives Prior to Instruction	15
4.	Distribution of Pupil Mastery by Instructional Objective as a Result of Instruction	16
5.	Distribution of the Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered After Instruction for Total Population	17
6.	Distribution of Percentage of Pupils Achieving Various Levels of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	18

Chapter I: THE PROGRAM

A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM

This program was designed to serve children attending the special day schools, psychiatric hospitals and day and residential treatment centers for the socially maladjusted and emotionally disturbed in Kindergarten to 12th grade, who were in need of an extended school year program in reading. The stated purpose of the program was "to improve achievement in reading and to provide meaningful socialization activities for these children during the summer months."

The proposal called for provisions for instruction for approximately 1,640 Title I eligible pupils for 3-1/2 hours each day for 28 days in school, agency, or institutional settings. The program was to take place in 12 special day schools for socially maladjusted or emotionally disturbed children, nine psychiatric hospitals, 16 day and/or residential treatment centers for emotionally handicapped children, and 30 day and/or residential treatment centers for addicted children. These 67 sites were located in all of the five boroughs of New York City and four sites in upstate New York. They were clustered into 21 school organizations for purpose of supervision of the instructional program. There was to be a maximum class size of 10 pupils to each teacher.

The objective of the program was "To help pupils achieve mastery of instructional objectives in reading which they fail prior to instruction as measured by the CROFT (Reading) criterion referenced tests." Consequently, the instructional program was to include testing of all participants with standardized criterion referenced entry and mastery tests. The former was to be administered to identify one or more specific

reading skill needs for each student, while the latter was to determine if the student had acquired any of these skills during the course of the program. Small group and individualized instruction directed toward remediation of the identified specific reading needs of each pupil was to be conducted by 177 teachers assisted by 46 paraprofessionals under the supervision of 21 teachers-in-charge. A trip program of common experiential activities, coordinated by a trip teacher, was to be utilized to stimulate language skills development, provide recreational opportunities, and opportunities for wholesome socializing experiences.

The basic daily program structure was to consist of two segments: one period of at least 1-1/2 hours in reading in small groups or individualized; and one additional segment in activities designed to apply and reinforce reading skills. Recreational activities were to be spread throughout the school day.

Two assistant coordinators assisted by two secretaries were to be responsible for the supervision of the program dividing their responsibilities geographically. They were to coordinate the instructional program, serve as liaison with related programs, and work closely with the evaluator.

There were to be 21 on-site secretaries provided to assist the teachers in-charge in maintaining student records, preparing reports, inventories, requisitions, and payrolls.

The program was to commence on July 1, 1975 and continue through August 15, 1975. The number of days of instruction were expected to vary from site to site (23 to 28 days) depending on the needs of the children and the program of the agency in which the program was located.

B. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAM

1. The Pupils

The population of the program consisted of 1,484 Title I eligible pupils. During the course of the program a total of 1,588 pupils were served. However, there were 104 pupils (7 percent) who did not complete the program. This was due in part to the transient nature of the participants in the hospitals and residential treatment settings, as well as to the emotional unavailability of some of the pupils. Overall, 93 percent of the pupils completed the program.

In the 12 day schools, all students attending during the regular school year were informed of the summer program by their teachers, guidance counselors, and principals both by written and verbal communications prior to the end of the term. All students volunteered. Applicants were reviewed by the staff and had to be two years below grade level in reading and eligible for Title I funds to be approved for participation in the program. Several schools accepted pupils (approximately 10 percent) who would be entering the school as regular pupils in the Fall term and referrals by community schools. The number of students in the program varied from school to school, with many having more volunteers than allotted places, and a few having low registration. It was noted that these latter sites had less advance publication of the program. Also, at sites where there was insufficient registration, teacher and/or paraprofessionals were reassigned to sites with large enrollments.

The cluster schools attempted to include all eligible students in the program. At residential centers all eligible children participated, if space permitted, both on a voluntary and mandatory basis depending on the policy of the agency. Most of the day treatment centers had continued

their regular program into the summer and had a ready population who were eager to participate. Generally there were more students volunteering than could be accommodated.

Without exception, the pupils exhibited very positive attitudes toward the program. Their behavior was goal directed and in all ways appropriate to the setting. They seemed to enjoy good relationships with the staff and each other.

2. The Staff

There were from one to eight teachers at each site, depending on the number needed to maintain a 1 to 10 ratio between teacher and students for a total of 178 teachers. Almost half (30) of the 67 sites had from one to three paraprofessionals, totalling 46.

Wherever possible the staff consisted of teachers and paraprofessionals who taught at that site during the regular school year. In instances where there were insufficient teachers from that site to staff the summer program teachers from other schools were assigned.

It was interesting to note that while this program was primarily concerned with reading, the teachers were not required to have had prior experience in the teaching of reading. Many of the teachers were actually working out of license, although they all had had experience with special education.

The trip teacher coordinated the trip program, which differed from site to site. This aspect of the program served both as a recreational activity and a common experience from which to develop language arts skills.

The 21 teachers-in-charge were all principals. Some were at their regular schools; others were supervising clusters. It was their responsibility to supervise the operation of all aspects of the program. They were supposed to be thoroughly versed in the instructional component

of the program, so that they could provide assistance to the teachers when needed.

There were two assistant coordinators who visited the sites throughout the duration of the program. They provided assistance and guidance wherever required to the teachers-in-charge, the teachers, and to the evaluator.

Due to the fact that this was the first time that criterion-referenced testing (CRT) was being used in these schools, a staff person who is an expert in this area was called upon to serve the entire program as the Reading Coordinator. He conducted three orientation meetings at various times, one preceding and two during the early weeks of the program to familiarize the staff with the testing and instructional procedures, as well as being always available for advice throughout the program. He also prepared a guide to the selection of instructional materials suitable for remediation of each instructional objective. These were made available to the teaching staff.

The program coordinator was the overseer for the entire program. He made spot visits to determine the effectiveness of the program, and maintained liaison with State, Federal, and New York City Board of Education offices and bureaus involved with the program.

Overall, the staff was composed of people who had all worked in special education settings prior to this program. They were familiar with the nature of the students in the program, and with ways of assisting the students in order to promote learning.

3. Functioning of the Program

All students were tested by teachers during the first or second week of the program (July 1 to July 10). Delays were caused by the teachers'

lack of familiarity with the procedures involved in CRT. As soon as this was recognized emergency orientations were conducted by the Reading Coordinator. Teachers-in-charge and reading teachers at the schools also assisted those staff members who were unsure about how to proceed. Thus, the problem was rectified considerably.

Once teachers had identified the specific reading objectives for each student the instructional process began. Materials and equipment available at the schools were utilized to develop individualized or small group instruction based on remediation of identified disabilities. However, several sites had barely adequate instructional materials.

The basic design of the instructional program was maintained for the most part, with one and a half hours used for reading in small groups or individually, and a segment for activities to reinforce these skills. The recreational component ranged from playing ball in the schoolyard to a formal trip program. There was some variability evidenced in the regularity of the trips scheduled. At some schools it was a weekly ongoing event to places such as the Statue of Liberty, the Aquarium, the Bronx Zoo, etc. Several schools had weekly swimming, while still another had daily after-school activities (i.e., bicycle trips) conducted by the staff on a voluntary basis.

All students were given mastery tests at some point during the program. The large majority of teachers administered these tests during the last week of contact with the students, while a small proportion of teachers who were more familiar with CRT had students take the test when mastery was indicated informally on an individual basis.

Many teachers did not understand the record-keeping system adequately. However, this did not necessarily interfere with the instructional program,

although the achievement data might have been affected.

In summary, the program was operational from July 1 to August 15 at 67 sites. There were 1,488 pupils participating, all of whom fulfilled Title I criteria. The staff consisted of 24 administrators and supervisors (coordinators and teachers-in-charge), 178 teachers, 46 classroom para-professionals, and 24 secretaries. The instructional program utilized CRT and individualized and/or small group instruction in accordance with the design of the program. Almost all of the teachers were initially unfamiliar with the procedures and record keeping system involved in the program. The instructional materials varied from site to site, with some utilizing Reading Laboratories, and others having barely adequate supplies.

Chapter II: EVALUATIVE PROCEDURES

A. EVALUATION OBJECTIVES

1. To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master.

Using the May 1975 Title I citywide test results as a leveler, all participants were administered, as a pretest, selected criterion-referenced tests from the CROFT (Reading) system to ascertain individual instructional objectives for each pupil. For instructional objective diagnosed as requiring remediation (as determined by pretest failure), a posttest was administered on an individual basis after an appropriate interval of instruction. For each instructional objective, results of passing and failing on both the pre- and posttest were supposed to be recorded on the Class Evaluation Record. However the notation of failed posttests was omitted by the program.

Table 1 shows the analysis of the data in tabular form ascertaining the percentage of participants demonstrating mastery or non-mastery of each instructional objective (according to SED classification system) at initial testing and final testing.

2. To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

The same methods and procedures were used to evaluate this objective as were used for the first objective, as stated above. The data were analyzed and presented in tabular and narrative form to ascertain each of the following distributions:

The distribution of pupils failing to demonstrate mastery prior to instruction and not receiving sufficient instruction to receive the posttest

is shown in Table 2.

The distribution of pupils demonstrating mastery of objectives prior to instruction is shown in Table 3.

The distribution of pupil mastery as a result of instruction by instructional objectives is shown in Table 4.

The distribution of the number of objectives mastered as a result of instruction is shown in Table 5.

The distribution of percentage of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives is shown in Table 6.

3. To determine the extent to which the program, as actually carried out, coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

Forty percent of the participating 67 sites were visited by the evaluator. The personnel at each site were interviewed, as were a sampling of the students. Instructional materials, plans, tests and records were examined. All classes (total of 86) at each site were observed.

B. OBSERVATION OF THE PROGRAM

The evaluation design called for 16 school visitation days. Those sites were to be observed which had the largest number of teachers and students and represented the three school classifications in the program. Consequently 27 sites were observed, eight day schools, eight residential centers, and 10 day treatment centers. They were located in each of the five boroughs of New York.

Overall, 846 students, 86 teachers, and 24 paraprofessionals participated at the sites visited by the evaluator. Thus, the observed student population (846) was 57 percent of the target population of 1,484 students, 86 teachers were 48 percent of the 177 participating teachers, and 24 paraprofessionals

were more than half (52 percent) of the 46 paraprofessionals. Consequently it was assumed that a representative selected sample of the entire program was observed.

C. LIMITATIONS OF THE DATA

This was the initial exposure of almost all of the staff in the program to a CRT approach to reading instruction. Despite efforts at orientation, there is evidence of inappropriate initial selection of the tests. Also, the Crfot (Reading) system extends to the sixth grade level whereas the program was designed to service students through the twelfth grade. Consequently it was assumed that some of the pupils were beyond the scope of the tests used. However, the most relevant limitation to an interpretation of the data was the program's authorization of the omission of failed posttests from the Class Evaluation Record. The ramifications of these limitations are discussed with the findings.

Chapter III: FINDINGS

The following presentation of findings is in accordance with the evaluation design specifications regarding the analysis of data relating to each of the objectives.

The first evaluation objective was:

> To determine if, as a result of participation in the program, 70 percent of the pupils master at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master.

This evaluation objective was satisfied as 70 percent of the population who completed the program (N = 1484) mastered at least one objective after instruction.

Table 1 provides a complete description of the CRT system utilization and ascertains the numbers and percentages of participants who took each of the subtests, and the numbers and percents of those demonstrating mastery or non-mastery of each instructional objective at initial and final testing. Examination of the tests administered indicates that a total of 7344 tests were given at the initial testing, indicating that each of the 1588 pupils who began the program had between four and five initial tests. These included 21 different subtests, with some given to less than 1 percent of the pupils and others given to as many as 62 percent. Three instructional objective tests on Organizing Information (SED classifications) were taken by more than half of the total population: (Classifying (2-4-2); Identifying Details (2-4-4) and Main Idea (2-4-6). Sixty-two percent of the pupils were given the Classifying Test with 72 percent of those taking it mastering it on the initial testing; 58 percent of the 62 percent of pupils taking the test on Main Idea mastered it on the initial testing; and 44 percent of the

TABLE 1

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPILS TESTED ON EACH INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE, THEIR MASTERY OR NON-MASTERY ON INITIAL AND FINAL TESTS, IN NUMBERS AND PERCENTAGES
(N = 1588)

Instructional Objectives (SED Classification)	Pupils Tested for Each Objective		Initial Testing: Pupils Demonstrating Mastery		Initial Testing: Pupils Demonstrating Non-Mastery		Final Testing: Pupils Demonstrating Mastery		Final Testing: Pupils Demonstrating Non-Mastery	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N[a]	%
2-1-1	314	20	214	14	100	6	72	4	28	2
2-1-2	347	22	285	18	62	4	44	3	18	1
2-1-3	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-1-4	335	21	196	12	139	9	84	5	55	3
2-1-5	289	18	83	5	206	13	132	8	74	5
2-1-6	414	26	128	8	286	18	165	10	121	8
2-1-7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-1-8	1	b	--	--	1	b	--	--	1	b
2-1-9	129	8	95	5	34	2	25	2	9	b
2-1-10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-2-1	215	13	202	13	13	b	11	b	2	b
2-2-2	191	12	137	9	54	3	44	3	10	b
2-2-3	291	18	258	16	33	2	26	2	7	b
2-2-4	389	24	274	17	115	7	97	6	18	1
2-2-5	199	13	149	9	50	3	41	3	9	b
2-2-6	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-2-7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-2-8	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-4-1	165	10	119	7	46	3	19	1	27	2
2-4-2	992	62	713	45	279	17	149	9	130	8
2-4-3	447	28	297	19	150	9	90	5	60	4
2-4-4	847	53	369	23	478	30	326	20	152	10
2-4-5	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-4-6	995	62	577	36	418	26	271	17	147	9
2-4-7	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-4-8	289	18	101	6	188	12	110	7	78	5
2-4-9	326	21	137	9	189	12	67	4	122	8
2-4-10	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-4-11	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-4-12	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
2-4-13	166	10	95	6	71	4	47	3	24	1
2-5-6	3	b	--	--	3	b	3	b	--	--
Total	7344									

[a]These numbers include 104 dropouts who are impossible to identify in the data due to the record keeping system utilized by the program.

[b]Less than 1 percent.

53 percent tested on Identifying Details did likewise.[1] Obviously attention needs to be given to developing a means to facilitate the selection of appropriate subtests.

The inappropriateness of test selection is underscored by the fact that across all subtests given initially 13 subtests of the 21 subtests (62 percent) were mastered by larger percentages of students than failed. However, on the final testing given to those demonstrating non-mastery on the initial testing, larger percentages of pupils mastered than failed 18 out of 20 (90 percent) of the tests. These data indicated that this approach to reading instruction was effective. Possibly more judicious selection of subtests would have yielded even more favorable results.

The second evaluation objective was:

> To determine, as a result of participation in the program, the extent to which pupils demonstrate mastery of instructional objectives.

Table 2 shows the distribution of pupils failing to exhibit mastery on the pretest prior to instruction, who had not demonstrated mastery by the end of the program on some or all of the skills attempted. Without additional information it is impossible to determine whether or not these students were given final tests and failed them, or received insufficient instruction to warrant a posttest, or did not complete the program, as was the case with 104 students. The method of recording on the CER calls for notation only when the pupil masters the test, not for failure of retest, or absent from posttest, or who dropped out of the program. This procedure requires change for these data to be obtained.

---

[1] The relative percents cited in the text are based on the ratio of $\frac{\text{number of pupils mastering initial subtest}}{\text{number of pupils taking the subtest}}$.

TABLE 2

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL NON-MASTERY ON PRETEST AND NO POSTTEST FOLLOW-UP
(N = 1588)[a]

Number of Instructional Objectives Failed	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
9-10	7	b
7- 8	4	b
5- 6	52	3
3- 4	122	8
1- 2	399	25
None	1004	63

[a]This number includes 104 dropouts who are impossible to identify in the data due to the record keeping system utilized by the program.

[b]Less than 1 percent.

The data indicate that 37 percent of the total population had not mastered skills requiring remediation (1 percent non-mastered 7-10 objectives, 3 percent non-mastered 5-6 objectives, 8 percent non-mastered 3-4 objectives, and 25 percent non-mastered 1-2 objectives). The largest group (25 percent) exhibited non-mastery of 1-2 objectives which is as many as should be attempted at one time. Some of these students had mastered other objectives after instruction. Perhaps students were expected to do more than time permitted by teachers who were themselves unfamiliar with the CRT approach in general, and reading instruction, in particular. It should be noted that these data include the 104 students who did not complete the program and who are unidentifiable therein.

The distribution of pupils demonstrating mastery of objectives prior

to instruction is shown on Table 3. Almost half (46 percent) of the students mastered 0-25 percent of the objectives when first tested, with 28 percent demonstrating mastery on 76 to 100 percent of the tests administered to them. These data reinforce the need for developing a criterion or guide for appropriate selection of initial tests for the individual pupil.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES PRIOR TO INSTRUCTION (N = 1588)[a]

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
76-100%	445	28
51- 75%	180	11
26- 50%	225	15
0- 25%	738	46

[a]This number includes 104 dropouts who are impossible to identify in the data due to the record keeping system utilized by the program.

Table 4 provides a detailed overview of pupil mastery as a result of instruction by each instructional objective. Twenty objectives were mastered by pupils ranging from 35 to 100 percent. The median percent of mastery was 66 percent. Forty-three percent of the objectives (9 subtests) were mastered by more than 70 percent of the pupils who attempted them. However, 57 percent (12 subtests) were mastered by fewer than 69 percent of the pupils attempting them on the final testing. This latter statement is an assumption since no notations are called for if non-mastery is demonstrated.

The effects of the instructional program are presented in Table 5 which shows the distribution of the number of instructional objectives

TABLE 4

DISTRIBUTION OF PUPIL MASTERY BY INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVE AS A RESULT OF INSTRUCTION
(N = 1484)

Instructional Objective	Ratio[a]	Percentage of Mastery
2-1-1	72/100	72
2-1-2	44/66	71
2-1-4	84/139	60
2-1-5	132/206	64
2-1-6	165/286	58
2-1-8	0/1	0
2-1-9	25/34	74
2-2-1	11/13	85
2-2-2	44/54	82
2-2-3	26/33	79
2-2-4	97/115	84
2-2-5	41/50	82
2-4-1	19/46	41
2-4-2	149/279	53
2-4-3	90/150	60
2-4-4	326/478	68
2-4-6	271/418	65
2-4-8	110/118	59
2-4-9	67/189	35
2-4-13	47/71	66
2-5-6	3/3	100

[a] Ratio is $\frac{\text{number of pupils achieving mastery}}{\text{number of pupils attempting mastery}}$

mastered as a result of instruction. Seventy percent of the pupils mastered at least one instructional objective post-instruction while 30 percent did not master any. The largest proportion (48 percent) of the pupils mastered from one to two objectives, with 17 percent mastering three to four objectives. Only 5 percent mastered more than five objectives. These findings are most logical considering the short duration of the program and the staffs' initial lack of familiarity with the CRT approach to the teaching of reading.

TABLE 5

DISTRIBUTION OF THE NUMBER OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES MASTERED AFTER INSTRUCTION FOR TOTAL POPULATION (N = 1484)

Number of Instructional Objectives Mastered	Total Population N	%
None	456	30
1- 2	709	48
3- 4	257	17
5- 6	57	4
7- 8	3	b
9-10	2	b

[a]Totals 100 percent with two groups of less than 1 percent.

[b]Less than 1 percent

Table 6 presents the distribution of percentages of pupils achieving various levels of mastery of instructional objectives. The largest proportion (44 percent) of pupils achieved at the 90-100 percent level, meaning that they mastered almost all of the objectives attempted. The second

largest grouping at the 0-9 percent level (28 percent) mastered less than 10 percent of the objectives they attempted. Here, too, the importance of initial subtest selection is manifested by the distribution of 72 percent (44 percent and 28 percent) of the pupils at either extreme.

TABLE 6

DISTRIBUTION OF PERCENTAGE OF PUPILS ACHIEVING VARIOUS LEVELS OF MASTERY OF INSTRUCTIONAL OBJECTIVES (N = 1484)

Percentage of Mastery of Instructional Objectives	Number of Pupils	Percentage of Pupils
90-100%	656	44
80- 89%	14	1
70- 79%	19	1
60- 69%	114	8
50- 59%	122	8
40- 49%	13	1
30- 39%	70	5
20- 29%	46	3
10- 19%	9	1
0- 9%	421	28

In summary, these data reveal that the program was successful in that it met its primary objective in that 70 percent of the participants mastered at least one instructional objective after instruction which they had not mastered previously. Further evidence of the merit of this approach was the mastery of 20 instructional objectives by 35 to 100 percent of the students attempting them.

A need for more specific initial test selection criteria is indicated

by the fact that over half the students in the program were given three subtests as shown on Table 1: Classifying (2-4-2); Identifying Details (2-4-4); and Main Idea (2-4-6). Given the wide range of grades served by the program it seems unlikely that such a large proportion of participants would be deficient in the same skills. In fact, the Class Evaluation Records show that entire classes were often given the same tests, which is not the intent or methodology of the CRT individualized system of reading instruction.

The third evaluation objective was:

> To determine the extent to which the program as actually carried out coincided with the program as described in the Project Proposal.

The program was implemented as called for in the proposal with respect to dates of operation, sites, staff, objectives, activities and materials, and services the needs of the population for which it was designed. The only departure from the proposal was in the size of the target population. The proposal called for approximately 1640 pupils and the actual program had 1484 participants, a difference of 9 percent. During the six weeks in which the program was in operation there were 1,588 participants. However, 104 students dropped out before the program terminated. Consequently 1,484 participants completed the program, or 93 percent of the actual population.

Several of the underenrolled sites were visited by the evaluator and as far as could be determined there was insufficient advance publication of the program. This was particularly noticeable at sites where the staff was notified very late about their participation in the program, or where the staff was not from the regular teaching faculty at that school, thus

indicating the need for increased articulation between the summer staff and the regular staff, at least at the supervisory level prior to the beginning of the program.

The liaison factor also contributed a great deal to the wide range of instructional materials available to the program. Where the summer staff was from the school, there were generally greater access to all of the schools' resources. Nevertheless, with the exception of one site visited, all had at minimum adequate, and most had extensive materials and equipment. Three of these sites were using the school's Reading Laboratories equipped with sophisticated hardware and software.

At all of the sites visited a sample of at least 10 percent of the students were interviewed with respect to how they felt about the program. In almost all instances the responses were enthusiastic. The comments encompassed the teachers, the activities, and the reading program. These positive feelings and attitudes were obvious as the students, in all but five of the 86 classes observed were actively engaged in what they were doing. Also, examination of their work folders indicated their seriousness of purpose.

In reviewing the functioning of the program three staffing issues deserve consideration. First, it was evident from on-site observations and the data reported, that the presence of a teacher-in-charge daily is essential for optimal functioning of the program, except in several highly specialized treatment centers. Where this would be unfeasible, one teacher should be given responsibility for coordinating the program and maintaining contact with the teacher-in-charge. This was the case in more than one-half (8 out of 14 sites) of the cluster schools visited.

Second, at sites where the summer program staff is not regular staff at that school communication between the summer program staff and the regular school staff and supervisors needs improvement. A liaison person for each site where there are out-of-school staff, to serve in this capacity before the summer would enhance the program.

Last, but of paramount importance, the teaching staff should have had experience with the teaching of reading to the greatest extent possible and be thoroughly familiar with the methodology associated with a CRT system.

The 1974 summer program evaluation made seven recommendations. They will be cited and followed by a statement regarding their implementation:

1. Make sure that each school can agree on a common test to be used or a common set, or no more than two or three tests.

2. Make sure that each school has an adequate number of the required tests on hand to meet the evaluation and testing needs.

3. Recreational and community visitation should be continued.

These recommendations were implemented into the 1975 summer program. Criterion-referenced tests were selected from the CROFT reading system. These were in the form of rexographed stenciles, from which the required number of copies were duplicated as needed. The recreational and visitation phase was continued under the supervision of the trip coordinator.

4. Recycle and expand the program to service more pupils maintaining existing pupil-staff ratios.

5. More funding for lower teacher-pupil ratios would be helpful.

6. Each summer school must be provided with sufficient educational materials. Where requested this should include programmed materials such as the MIND kits and the EDL kits.

Since additional funds were not available, the program did not have

the financial resources to incorporate these suggestions into the program. However, with respect to materials, each school was asked to provide adequate supplies and instructional materials. All sites had adequate materials, with some having much more than others.

7. Intersetting communications regarding educational techniques must be fostered through more planned meetings. This should be done before the start of the summer program if possible.

The response to this recommendation in the proposal referred to the continuous widespread expansion during the regular school year of an individualized reading program of diagnosis and prescription, with accompanying intra-school workshops. However when considering that many of the summer staff were not involved with teaching reading during the year, the need for a total orientation program is reaffirmed. If this cannot be conducted prior to the beginning of the program due to funding restrictions, the first day of the program should be a full day intensive orientation, consisting of demonstrations and workshops for all supervisors, teachers, and paraprofessionals. This is the only way to insure maximal effectiveness of the reading program.

Chapter IV: SUMMARY OF MAJOR FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major evaluation objective of this program was achieved in that 70 percent of the participants mastered at least one instructional objective which prior to the program they did not master. The data further indicated that the CRT system was an effective instructional procedure as evidenced by the post-instruction mastery of 20 instructional objectives by 35 to 100 percent of the students attempting them.

Program implementation was as proposed with the exception of having 90 percent (1484) of the anticipated 1640 participants. The pupils expressed and observed attitudes and behaviors further attested to the effectiveness of the program. In consideration of the factors mentioned above it is strongly recommended that this program be recycled.

The following recommendations for strengthening the program were based on the findings and site observations:

1. There should be provisions for an intensive orientation program. If it cannot be arranged prior to the program because of funding problems, one full day should be devoted to an orientation workshop for all staff members. The criterion-referenced test individualized approach to teaching reading should be thoroughly explored. Test selection, pretesting, retesting, scoring, record keeping, should be among the aspects discussed. Instructional methods and materials should be reviewed. Complete printed, descriptive materials with examples should be distributed to every staff member.

2. All sites should have a teacher-in-charge to supervise the instructional and recreational activities. Where this is unfeasible one teacher should be responsible for coordinating the program and be directly accountable to the teacher-in-charge.

3. The instructional staff should to the greatest extent possible have had prior experience in the teaching of reading.

4. At each site, the summer program's teacher-in-charge should act as a liaison to articulate on behalf of the program with the regular supervisor in instances where this is a different person and staff. This should begin in early Spring to assure advance

publicity for the program, facilitate selection of pupils, and permit utilization of the schools' or centers' instructional materials, reading laboratories and supplies.

5. The record keeping procedures for a criterion-referenced test system should be simplified. All posttest data, pass, fail, or absent should be included for each pupil.

6. The program should be expanded to service a greater number of eligible pupils maintaining the same teacher-pupil ratio.